R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 689 24

FACTORS AFFECTING COLLABORATION BETWEEN SCHOOL AND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION PROGRAMS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED.

BY- GOTTWALD, HENRY L.
EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIV., YPSILANTI

REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-115 PUB DATE 65
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$2.68 67P.

DESCRIPTORS- *MENTALLY HANDICAPPED, *VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, *COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS, *REHABILITATION PROGRAMS, *QUESTIONNAIRES, SECONDARY EDUCATION, TEACHERS, COUNSELORS, YPSILANTI, MICHIGAN

THE COOPERATIVE EFFORT BETWEEN SECONDARY SCHOOLS WITH PROGRAMS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED (MR) AND THE REGIONAL OFFICES OF THE DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION (DVR) WAS REPORTED. QUESTIONNAIRES WERE MAILED TO DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS, TEACHERS OF THE MR'S, REGIONAL OFFICES OF DVR, AND COUNSELORS. A TOTAL OF 507 WERE MAILED AND 86.8 PERCENT RESPONDED. ANALYSIS OF DATA WAS CONDUCTED UNDER THREE MAJOR GROUPINGS--(1) SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH SECONDARY PROGRAMS FOR THE MR, (2) TEACHERS FOR THE MR FUNCTIONING IN THESE PROGRAMS, AND (3) VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELORS. THE FINDINGS INDICATED THAT ONLY 30 PERCENT OF THE RESPONDING DISTRICTS HAD MADE REFERRALS TO DVR WITHIN THE YEAR. TEACHERS WERE FOUND TO HAVE LITTLE EXPOSURE TO THE SERVICES OF DVR, ALTHOUGH COUNSELORS AGREED THAT DVR SHOULD SERVE THE MENTALLY RETARDED. IT WAS SUGGESTED THAT MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND THEIR SCHOOL PROGRAMS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF REHABILITATION COUNSELORS. (RS)

ED003689

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

FACTORS AFFECTING COLLABORATION BETWEEN SCHOOL AND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION PROGRAMS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Cooperative Research Project, Number S-115

Author: Dr. Henry L. Gottwald

Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan

1965

The Research Reported Herein Was Supported By
The Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Statement of the Problem	4
Objectives and/or Hypothesis	6
Related Research	6
Procedure	8
Analysis of the Data and Findings	9
Conclusions and Implications	21
Appendices	23
Tables	24
Instruments	
1. (A) Cover Letter	52
(B) Program Questionnaire	53
2. (A) Cover Letter	54
(B) Teacher Questionnaire	55
3. (A) Cover Letter	
(B) Counselor Questionnaire	58
Bibliography	61

Table Number

Page

Number of Referrals to
Vocational Rehabilitation Last Year (1963-64)

1. Size of School District. 24
2. Number of Students in Secondary Programs for Mentally Retarded. 25
3. Age of Secondary Program in Mental Retardation . . . 26
4. Number of Students Completing Secondary Program for the Mentally Retarded. 27
5. Districts Utilizing Intelligence Quotient Cutoff Limits .
   (A) Maximum I.Q.. 29
   (B) Minimum I.Q. 30
6. District Identification of Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor. 31
7. Title of Respondent to Questionnaire 32
8. Average of Teachers' Perception About:
   (A) Potential Employers' Concepts about Mental Retardates 33
   (B) Potential Employers' Attitude Towards Hiring Mental Retardates. 33

Average Number of District Referrals
To Vocational Rehabilitation

9. Teachers' Professional Degree. 34
10. Teachers' State Approval Status. 35
11. Teachers' Knowledge about Vocational Rehabilitation. 36
12. Average of Teachers' Perception About:
   (A) Potential Employers' Concepts about Mental Retardates. 37
   (B) Potential Employers' Attitude Towards Hiring Mental Retardates 38

Table Number

Page

Degree Status of Teachers

13. State Approval 39
14. Course Work in Vocational Rehabilitation and Guidance 39
15. Knowledge about Vocational Rehabilitation. 40
16. Where Familiarity with Vocational Rehabilitation Acquired 40
17. Should Vocational Rehabilitation Serve Mental Retardates 41
18. Teachers' Perception About:
    (A) Potential Employers' Concepts about Mental Retardates 42
    (B) Potential Employers' Attitudes Towards Hiring Mental Retardates 42

Approval Status of Teachers

19. Course Work in Vocational Rehabilitation and Guidance 43
20. Knowledge About Vocational Rehabilitation. 43
21. Where Familiarity with Vocational Rehabilitation Acquired 44
22. Should Vocational Rehabilitation Serve Mental Retardates 44
23. Teachers' Perceptions About:
    (A) Potential Employers' Concepts about Mental Retardates 45
    (B) Potential Employers' Attitude Towards Hiring Mental Retardates 45
24. Professional Training of Teachers and District Referrals to Vocational Rehabilitation 46

Table Number Page

Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors' Years of Experience

25. Should Vocational Rehabilitation Serve Mental Retardates. 47

26. Comments about the Role of Vocational Rehabilitation and Mental Retardation 48

27. Knowledge of Educational Programs for Mental Retardates 49

28. Counselors' Perceptions About:
(A) Potential Employers' Concepts about Mental Retardates 50
(B) Potential Employers' Attitude Towards Hiring Mental Retardates. 51

Problem

The purpose and philosophy of both Special Education and Vocational Rehabilitation are closely related; however, the liaison and degree of communication between secondary school programs for the mentally retarded and the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) appears to be an area open for investigation. While both of these disciplines have common goals and objectives, there has been little or no emperical data to indicate how, or to what extent, they cooperate with one another, nor has there been anything to indicate what factors may be instrumental in the degree of cooperation. The President's Panel on Mental Retardation states that a major barrier in the vocational rehabilitation services for the mentally handicapped has been the "failure of the public and rehabilitation placement agencies to collaborate and to work toward the common objectives." Undoubtedly, many factors are involved in this lack of cooperation. Some of these factors may be apparent in existing school programs for the mentally retarded, while others may be related to the professional training of the personnel involved. This study explores the present degree of collaboration between secondary school programs for the mentally retarded in Michigan and the DVR.

Objectives

The objectives of this study are to survey and explore the present status of collaboration and/or liaison between secondary schools having programs for the mentally retarded and the regional offices of DVR in the state of Michigan. A concomitant objective of this study is the identification of specific areas for further investigation.

Particular attention will be focused upon secondary school programs for the mentally retarded and the professional training and experience of those rehabilitation counselors and teachers for the educable mentally retarded. Specifically, this includes an investigation of:

(A) School programs -- What factors (if any) in secondary programs for the mentally retarded appear significantly related to the number of referrals from these programs to DVR.

(B) Professional training -- What factors (if any) in the professional training and experience of teachers and vocational rehabilitation counselors appear significant.

(C) Experience -- What factors (other than professional training) appear significantly related to the degree of collaboration between teachers and vocational rehabilitation counselors as related to the field of mental retardation.

Specific Hypothesis to be tested:

School Programs

(1) Larger school programs for the mentally retarded will have more referrals to DVR.

(2) Programs for the mentally retarded that have been in existance longer will respond with more referrals to DVR.

Professional Training and/or Experience

(1) The professional training of teachers will affect district referrals to DVR.

(2) The professional training of teachers will affect their perceptions of potential employers' (1) concepts about mental retardates, and, (2) attitudes towards hiring mental retardates.

(3) Professional experiences of counselors will affect their perceptions of potential employers (1) concepts of mental retardates, and, (2) attitudes towards hiring mental retardates.

Related Research

Related research concerning the education and habilitation or rehabilitation of the mentally retarded is reflected by various articles that have appeared in various professional publications, particularily the Journal for Exceptional Children, The American Journal of Mental Deficiency, and Rehabilitation Review. (See bibliography) Some of the most significant contributors have been Cohen, DiMichael, Dybwad, Fraenkel, Mayo, Power, Seidenfeld, and the National Association for Retarded Children. Review of these articles and/or studies identifies a central theme revolving around various types of training programs, sheltered workshops, attitude studies, and placement problems. A few programs were identified (Illinois, New Jersey, Texas, Washington) as attempting cooperative efforts between schools and DVR. These programs were characterized by designating specific personnel as responsible for liaison between the two disciplines. Essentially, however, there appears to be a paucity of information concerning (1) the general communication and/or referral process between schools and DVR and (2) factors affecting this communication and/or referral process. In the report, entitled National Action to Combat Mental Retardation, the President's Panel on Mental Retardation identified the lack of collaboration between schools and agencies as a major problem in the habilitation of the mentally retarded. This tends to support the need for additional research in this area.

Procedures

This study encompasses all secondary school programs for the mentally retarded in the state of Michigan and the teachers involved in these programs. Also included in this study are the Michigan DVR and the

vocational rehabilitation counselors working out of regional offices throughout the state.

Through the Michigan Department of Public Instruction, 149 school systems were identified as having secondary programs for the mentally retarded. Cover letters and questionnaires (appendix) were mailed to the superintendents of these districts for dispersion or response, and a response of 127, or 85.2 percent, was recognized. Approximately 230 questionnaires and cover letters (appendix) were distributed to the secondary teachers of the mentally retarded who were employed by the various districts. One hundred and ninety three, or 83.9 percent, of the teachers responded with information.

A total of 67 questionnaires (appendix) were distributed through the regional offices for DVR, and a total of 61 vocational rehabilitation counselors, or 91 percent, responded.

Data was coded, put on cards and tabulated.

Analysis of Data and Findings

Data for the study was gathered from three major sources: (1) school districts with secondary programs for the mentally retarded, (2) teachers for the mentally retarded functioning in these school programs, and (3) vocational rehabilitation counselors. Analysis of the data was made under the same three major groupings.

SCHOOL PROGRAMS

One hundred and twenty seven districts (85.2 percent) responded with information on secondary school programs for the mentally retarded. It

is significant to note that of 127 districts responding, 89 districts (70 percent) reported that they had no referrals to DVR in the past school year. Holding the number of referrals to DVR independent (scaled from 0 to 9 referrals or more) the following variables were analyzed:

1. Size of school district
2. Number of students in secondary programs for mentally retarded
3. Age of secondary program in mental retardation
4. Number of students completing secondary program for the mentally retarded
5. Districts utilizing intelligence quotient cutoff limits
   (A) Maximum I.Q.'s
   (B) Minimum I.Q.'s
6. District identification of vocational rehabilitation counselor
7. Title of respondent to questionnaire
8. Average of teachers' perceptions about:
   (A) Potential employers' concepts about mental retardates
   (B) Potential employers' attitudes towards hiring mental retardates

Size of School District (Appendix - Table 1)

No extended trend was indicated by comparing the size of the school district with the number of referrals to DVR. It was interesting to note, however, that 71 districts (56 percent) of the total number of districts reporting (127) had school populations of 5,000 or less. comparison of the ratio of small school districts (5,000 students or less) making referrals to DVR with the ratio of large school districts (5,001 students or more) making referrals to DVR yielded statistical significance at the .01 level.

The 89 districts reporting no referrals to DVR ranged in size from fewer than 2,500 to more than 20,000, although 59 (66 percent) of those making no referrals were in districts of 5,000 or less.

Number of Students in Secondary Programs for the Mentally Retarded (Appendix, Table 2)

As might be expected, the number of referrals to DVR tends to increase with the number of students in the program for the mentally retarded. The ratio of districts making referrals also tends to increase with size. Of 124 reporting districts, 70 (57 percent) contained fewer than 31 students and only 10 (14.3 percent) had referrals to DVR. Fifty four districts (43 percent) contained 31 or more students in the secondar programs for the mentally retarded. Of these larger districts, 26 (48.1 percent) made referrals to DVR in the past year. Proportionate ratios of referral for programs with less than 31 students and for programs with 31 or more students was significant at the .01 level.

Age of Secondary Program in Mental Retardation (Appendix, Table 3)

The data indicates a general trend for older programs to have more referrals to DVR; however, no significance was found. Comparison of the mean age of those districts with no referrals to DVR (2.9 years) against the mean age of those districts with one or more referrals to DVR (5 years) yielded significance at the .01 level.

Number of Students Completing Secondary Program for the Mentally Retarded (Appendix - Table 4)

Of the 89 school districts having no referrals to DVR last year, only 32 (36 percent) reported data on the number of students finishing last year. These 32 districts reported that 150 students completed the

school program for the mentally retarded (or 4.7 students per district). Twenty seven of the 38 districts (71 percent) reporting referrals to DVR last year stated that 124 students finished the program (or 4.6 students per program). While the aforementioned figures seem to indicate that the number of students finishing a secondary program for the mentally retarded has no relationship to the number of referrals to DVR, the high number of districts (64 percent) having no referrals and not responding to this item suggests that perhaps these districts did not have any students finishing in the past year.

Districts Utilizing Intelligence Quotient Cutoff Limits (Appendix - Table 5, 5A, 5B)

District use of I.Q. limits for admission to programs was investigated for relationship to the number of referrals to DVR. No trend or relationship was evident.

District Identification of Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor (Appendix Table 6)

An effort was made to see whether a district could readily identify the local vocational rehabilitation counselor. The person answering for those districts that had referrals to DVR could identify the counselor 76 percent of the time, and this figure increased as the number of referrals per district increased. In those districts having no referrals to DVR, the person responding could only identify the vocational rehabilitation counselor 55 percent of the time. This suggests that lack of acquaintance with the services of DVR could affect the number of referrals that a district makes.

Title of Respondent to Questionnaire (Appendix, Table 7)

The instruments used in gathering information on school programs were disbursed to local school districts with the request that they be given to the most appropriate person for response. Of the total number of responses, teachers answered the query in 4.72 percent of the cases, principals 7.87 percent, directors of special education 25.2 percent, superintendents 33.86 percent and other personnel 28.35 percent. Comparing the various positions responding for the 89 districts with no referrals to DVR to the same positions for the 38 districts with referrals to DVR, we find differences which are significant at the .01 level for both directors of special education and school superintendents; however, these differences are inverted.

While many factors (size of program, etc.) may influence the aforementioned data, several things are suggested. Specifically, districts having a designated director of special education probably reflect more organization in this area, hence, greater acquaintance and contact with DVR. Conversely, where no designated person directs a special education program, the school superintendent may function in this capacity and for various reasons utilization of DVR decreases.

Average of Teachers Perceptions About: (A) Potential Employers' Concepts about Mental Retardates and (B) Potential Employers' Attitudes Towards Hiring Mental Retardates (Appendix, Tables 8A and 8B)

A modified version of scales developed by Cohen* was utilized to evaluate (1) teacher perception concerning potential employers' concepts

* See Appendix and Bibliography

about mental retardates and (2) potential employers' attitudes towards hiring mental retardates. Average scores for teachers within a school district were computed and compared to the number of referrals to DVR.

(A) Teachers' Perceptions of Potential Employers' Concepts About Retardates (Appendix, Table 8A) - Visual inspection of this data indicated the absence of a specific trend for school districts with referrals to DVR; however, of the 89 school districts with no referrals only 58 (65.2 percent) responded.

These 89 districts disclosed a mean score of 5.08. the mean score of the 34 responding districts (89.5 percent) having referrals to DVR is 7.99. This difference in mean scores for teachers in districts having no referrals to DVR and teachers in districts having referrals to DVR is significant at the .01 level.

(B) Teachers' Perceptions of Potential Employers' Attitudes Towards Hiring the Mentally Retarded (Appendix, Table 8B) - Inspection of data revealed no trend or difference in the above variable for teachers in districts having referrals to the DVR and teachers in those districts not having referrals

SECONDARY TEACHERS OF THE MENTALLY RETARDED

One hundred and ninety three secondary teachers of the mentally retarded (83.9 percent) answered our request for data concerning professional training and experience. Their responses were analyzed against two independent factors: (A) the average number of referrals to DVR from the district by which they are employed and (B) their professional training according to (1) degree status and (2) temporary or full state approval.*

* Michigan teachers meeting specified minimal qualifications in Special Education are granted temporary approval to teach in the area and must obtain full qualifications within a maximum of two years.

(A) The average number of district referrals were compared to the following factors:

1. The degree status of the teacher
2. State approval status
3. Knowledge about vocational rehabilitation
4. Average of teachers' perceptions of potential employers' concepts of mental retardates
5. Average of teachers' perceptions of potential employers' attitudes towards hiring mental retardates

In the Appendix, Tables 9 through 12, descriptively compare the number of referrals a district has to DVR with the aforementioned teacher variables. Since a district may have more than one teacher, hence different data, no conclusive statements can be made on these tables. Generally, the trend seems to impute that districts with the most referrals to DVR tend to reflect teachers on their staff with higher academic qualifications and more experience (Tables 9 and 10). There appears to be no relationship between the number of referrals to DVR and the degree of knowledge that a teacher has about vocational rehabilitation (Table 11); however, over one half (56 percent) of the teachers feel the need for additional knowledge about vocational rehabilitation. There is no relationship between the number of referrals that a district makes to the average of teacher perceptions about (1) potential employers' concepts about mental retardates or (2) potential employers' attitudes towards hiring mental retardates (Tables 12A and 12B).

(B) The professional training of teachers was analyzed according to:

(B1) Degree Status

1. State approval status
2. Course work in vocational rehabilitation and guidance
3. Knowledge about vocational rehabilitation
4. Where familiarity with vocational rehabilitation acquired
5. Should vocational rehabilitation serve the mentally retarded

6. Teachers' perceptions about:
   (a) Potential employers' concepts about mental retardates
   (b) Potential employers' attitudes towards hiring mental retardates

(B2) State approval status

1. Course work in vocational rehabilitation and guidance
2. Knowledge about vocational rehabilitation
3. Where familiarity with vocational rehabilitation acquired
4. Should vocational rehabilitation serve mentally retarded
5. Teachers' perceptions about:
   (a) Potential employers' concepts about mental retardates
   (b) Potential employers' attitudes towards hiring mental retardates

Professional Training (Degree and Approval Status)

As might be expected, Tables 13 through 23 indicate that as the qualifications of teachers improve through approval or advanced degrees, teachers take academic work which better qualifies them for their positions.

Table 24A relates the degree status of teachers to (1) employing districts having referrals to DVR and (2) employing districts not having referrals to DVR. There is statistical significance at the .05 level between teachers with bachelors degrees and teachers with graduate degrees on the aforementioned variables. Table 24B relates the approval status of teachers to whether or not the employing district had referrals to DVR. Again, statistical significance at the .05 level was recognized.

It is important to note, however, that again over one half of all the teachers feel the need for additional information about vocational

rehabilitation (Table 15 and Table 20). Most teachers appear to have acquired what familiarity they possess about vocational rehabilitation from their general academic preparation (Tables 16 and 21). Tables 17 and 22 disclose that about 83 to 90 percent of all teachers feel that DVR should serve the mentally retarded while from only 1 to 4 percent indicate opposition, with the balance of the teachers undecided. These figures are certainly not reflected by the number of referrals to DVR. Teachers' perceptions about potential employers' (1) concepts about mental retardates and (2) attitudes towards hiring mental retardates is in no way reflected by the level of academic degree or approval status (Tables 18 and 23).

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELORS

Sixty one vocational rehabilitation counselors (91 percent) responded with data requested by questionnaire. Holding the number of years of experience as a vocational rehabilitation counselor independent (Scaled from 0 to 9 years or more) the following variables were analyzed:

1. Should vocational rehabilitation serve the mentally retarded
2. Comments about the role of vocational rehabilitation and mental retardation
3. Familiarity with educational programs for the mentally retarded
4. Counselors' perceptions about:
   (a) Potential employers' concepts about mental retardates
   (b) Potential employers' attitude towards hiring mental retardates

Inspection of all the data indicates that the number of years of experien reflected by vocational rehabilitation counselors concentrated at two polarities. Forty one respondents (67 percent) indicated two years of experience or less while 17 (28 percent) indicated experience of 7

years or more as vocational rehabilitation counselors.

Should Vocational Rehabilitation Serve Mental Retardates (Appendix, Table 25)

Fifty vocational rehabilitation counselors (83 percent) indicated that DVR should serve the mentally retarded, while only three responding (5 percent) were opposed. Of the eight other counselors (12 percent) who were undecided, seven had less than two years of experience as a vocational rehabilitation counselor. Generally, the data indicated that as counselors acquire more experience, they become more convinced that DVR should serve the mentally retarded.

Comments About the Role of Vocational Rehabilitation and Mental Retardation (Appendix, Table 26)

An analysis was made on the content of comments which were made by counselors regarding the role of DVR and the area of mental retardation. This information was classified as positive, negative or neutral. No trend was indicated by the nature of the response to the number of years of experience that a counselor had. Thirty one counselors (50 percent) indicated positive sentiments, 16 counselors (27 percent) felt negative and the remaining 14 (23 percent) were neutral or did not respond to the question.

Familiarity with the Educational Program for Mental Retardates (Appendix, Table 27)

Counselors were questioned whether or not they felt familiar with the educational program for the mentally retarded. Forty counselors (66 percent) responded that they were familiar with the educational process,

while 19 (31 percent) responded that they were not. Two counselors (3 percent) did not respond to this question. No relationship between this variable and the years of experience as a vocational rehabilitation counselor was evident.

Counselors' Perceptions of Potential Employers' (1) Concepts of Mental Retardates and (2) Attitudes Towards Hiring Retardates (Appendix, Table 28A and 28B)

There is no apparent relationship between the length of a vocational rehabilitation counselors' experience and his perceptions of potential employers' (1) concepts about mental retardates or (2) attitudes towards hiring mental retardates.

TESTING OF HYPOTHESIS

School Programs

(1) Larger school programs for the mentally retarded will have more referrals to DVR.
Accepted - Refer to p 10 and Tables 1 and 2

(2) Programs for the mentally retarded that have been in existence longer will respond with more referrals to DVR.
Accepted - Refer to p 11 and Table 3

Professional Training and/or Experience

(1) The professional training of teachers will affect district referrals to DVR
Accepted - Refer to p 16 and Tables 24A and 24B

(2) The professional training of teachers will affect their perceptions of potential employers' (1) concepts about mental retardates, and, (2) attitudes towards hiring mental retardates.
Rejected -- Refer to p 16 and Tables 18A, 18B, 23A, 23B

(3) Professional experiences of counselors will affect their perceptions of potential employers' (1) concepts of mental retardates, and, (2) attitudes towards hiring

mental retardates.
Rejected - Refer to p 17 and Tables 25, 26, 27, 28.

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS

After the data from the various facets of the total study was tabulated and analyzed, interviews were held with individuals representing school programs, teachers, and DVR. These interviews represented an attempt to identify factors which may have affected the relationship between school programs and DVR which may not have been detected in the data.

School Programs

Some schools, particularly those with larger secondary programs for the mentally retarded, had their own placement services and felt that they could do as well as the DVR; therefore, these districts had few or no referrals. A few school districts expressed disappointment in past experiences with DVR; however, the vast majority were optimistic about future relations on the basis of recent experiences. One constant theme which appeared was the significance of a personal relationship between one or more teachers and a vocational rehabilitation counselor.

Vocational Rehabilitation

Most vocational rehabilitation counselors were very positive and optimistic about school-vocational rehabilitation relationships, particularly in the past few years. Counselors felt that referrals from school programs were better, that candidates were better prepared, etc. Again, the significance of a personal contact or relationship between the vocational rehabilitation counselor and one or more teachers was cited.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The single, most significant finding of this study is that only 30 percent of the responding districts with secondary programs for the mentally retarded had referrals to DVR in the past year. Comprehensive analysis of data indicates that smaller districts with relatively young secondary programs for the mentally retarded tend not to utilize the services of DVR while programs which are larger and have been in existence longer tend to have a higher ratio of referrals to the DVR.

Analysis of the professional training of secondary teachers for the mentally retarded indicates that the majority of teachers had periperhal exposure to the services offered by DVR, most of which was acquired in general academic courses. Over one half of all the respondents indicated the need for additional knowledge about the services offered by DVR.

Vocational rehabilitation counselors generally tend to agree that DVR should serve the mentally retarded, and most counselors are optimistic about the future relationship between school programs for the retarded and vocational rehabilitation. Many counselors identified the need for greater familiarity with mental retardation and with the educational process for the mentally retarded.

Implications

1. Effort should be made to fully acquaint all secondary programs for the mentally retarded with the services offered by DVR, particularly the newer and smaller programs.

2. The professional training of secondary teachers for the mentally retarded should include more information and/or exposure to the services offered by DVR.

3. The professional training of rehabilitation counselors should include more information about the mental retardation and about school programs for the mentally retarded.

4. Both secondary teachers of the mentally retarded and vocational rehabilitation counselors should expand efforts to collaborate in comprehensive programming for the mentally retarded.

APPENDIX

A. Tables

B. Instruments

1. (a) Cover letter

   (b) Program Questionnaire

2. (a) Cover letter

   (b) Teacher Questionnaire

3. Counselor Questionnaire

C. Bibliography

TABLE 1

SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT
SIZE OF DISTRICT

No. of Referrals	No. of Districts Reporting	0-2500	2500-5000	5000-7500	7500-10,000	10,000-12,500	12,500-15,000	15,000-17,500	17,500-20,000	20,000+	
0	89	35.96 (32)	30.34 (27)	8.99 (8)	7.87 (7)	2.25 (2)	5.62 (5)		1.12 (1)	5.62 (5)	2.2 (2)
1	12	8.33 (1)	8.33 (1)	16.67 (2)	8.33 (1)	16.67 (2)	8.33 (1)			8.33 (1)	25. (3)
2	9	11.11 (1)	22.22 (2)	11.11 (1)	11.11 (1)	11.11 (1)	11.11 (1)	11.11 (1)		11.11 (1)	
3	3		100.00 (1)								
4	5	20.00 (1)	20.00 (1)			20.00 (1)				40.00 (2)	
5	1			100.00 (1)							
6	1							100.00 (1)			
7	1	100.00 (1)									
9	6		16.67 (1)							66.67 (4)	16. (1)
	127	28.35 (36)	27.56 (35)	9.45 (12)	7.09 (9)	4.72 (6)	5.51 (7)	1.57 (2)	.79 (1)	10.24 (13)	4.7 (6)

Figures given in percentages
Number of actual responses in parentheses

TABLE 2
NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN SECONDARY PROGRAMS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED
NUMBER OF STUDENTS

No. of Referrals	No. of Districts Reporting	0-15	16-30	31-45	46-60	61-75	76-90	91-105	106-120	121+	
0	89	22.47 (20)	44.94 (40)	13.48 (12)	7.87 (7)	2.25 (2)	2.25 (2)			5.62 (5)	1. (1
1	12	16.67 (2)	8.33 (1)	25.00 (3)	8.33 (1)	16.67 (2)				25.00 (3)	
2	9	11.11 (1)	33.33 (3)		22.22 (2)					33.33 (3)	
3	3	66.67 (2)	33.33 (1)								
4	5			20.00 (1)	20.00 (1)	20.00 (1)	20.00 (1)			20.00 (1)	
5	1						100.00 (1)				
6	1							100.00 (1)			
7	1			100.00 (1)							
9	6					16.67 (1)	16.67 (1)	16.67 (1)		16.67 (1)	33 (2
	12	19.69 (25)	35.43 (45)	13.39 (17)	8.66 (11)	4.72 (6)	3.94 (5)	1.57 (2)		10.24 (13)	2. (3

Figures given in Percentages
Number of actual responses in parentheses.

TABLE 3
AGE OF SECONDARY PROGRAM IN MENTAL RETARDATION
AGE IN YEARS

No. of Referrals	No. of Districts Reporting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+	
0	89	29.21 (26)	16.85 (15)	15.72 (14)	7.87 (7)	10.11 (9)	5.62 (5)	1.12 (1)		3.37 (3)	1 (
1	12	8.33 (1)	8.33 (1)	33.33 (4)	8.33 (1)	8.33 (1)	8.33 (1)			16.67 (2)	8 (
2	9			33.33 (3)		22.22 (2)	22.22 (2)			22.22 (2)	
3	3				33.33 (1)	33.33 (1)				33.33 (1)	
4	5	20.00 (1)			20.00 (1)				20.00 (1)	20.00 (1)	2 (
5	1					100.00 (1)					
6	1		100.00 (1)								
7	1										1 (
9	6		16.67 (1)			33.33 (2)				50.00 (3)	
	127	22.05 (28)	14.17 (18)	16.54 (21)	7.87 (10)	12.60 (16)	6.30 (8)	.79 (1)	.79 (1)	9.45 (12)	9 (

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses in parentheses

TABLE 4
NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING
SECONDARY PROGRAM FOR THE
MENTALLY RETARDED

Referrals Last Year	No. of Districts in Sample	Number Responding	No. Students Finished Last Year	Districts Not Responding
0	89	32	150	57
1	12	9	33	3
2	9	7	25	2
3	3	2	7	1
4	5	2	13	3
5	1		3	
6	1		6	
7	1			1
9	6	5	37	1

TABLE 5
DISTRICTS UTILIZING INTELLIGENCE
QUOTIENT CUT-OFF LIMITS

No. of Referrals	No. of Districts Responding	Answer Yes	No	No Response
0	89	79.78 (71)	15.73 (14)	4.49 (4)
1	12	83.33 (10)	16.67 (2)	
2	9	44.44 (4)	55.55 (5)	
3	3	100.00 (3)		
4	5	60.00 (3)	40.00 (2)	
5	1	100.00 (1)		
6	1	100.00 (1)		
7	1	100.00 (1)		
9	6	83.33 (5)	16.67 (1)	
	127	77.95 (99)	18.90 (24)	3.15 (4)

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses in parentheses

TABLE 5A
MAXIMUM I.Q.

No. of Referrals	No. of Districts Reporting	I.Q. Scores				No Response
		60	70	80	90	
0	89		3.37 (3)	65.17 (58)	3.37 (3)	28.09 (25)
1	12		8.33 (1)	66.67 (8)	8.33 (1)	16.67 (2)
2	9			22.22 (2)		77.78 (7)
3	3			100.00 (3)		
4	5			40.00 (2)		60.00 (3)
5	1			100.00 (1)		
6	1			100.00 (1)		
7	1			100.00 (1)		
9	6			83.33 (5)		16.67 (1)
	127		3.15 (4)	63.78 (81)	3.15 (4)	29.92 (38)

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses in parentheses

TABLE 5B
MINIMUM I.Q.

No. of Referrals	No. of Districts Reporting	I.Q. Scores				No Response
		40	50	60	70	
0	89	1.12 (1)	42.70 (38)	15.73 (14)	7.87 (7)	32.58 (29)
1	12		50.00 (6)	25.00 (3)		25.00 (3)
2	9		11.11 (1)	11.11 (1)		77.78 (7)
3	3		100.00 (3)			
4	5		20.00 (1)	40.00 (2)		40.00 (2)
5	1				100.00 (1)	
6	1		100.00 (1)			
7	1					100.00 (1)
9	6		33.33 (2)	33.33 (2)		33.33 (2)
127		.79 (1)	40.94 (52)	17.32 (22)	6.30 (8)	34.65 (44)

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses in parentheses

TABLE 6
DISTRICT IDENTIFICATION OF
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELLOR

No. of Referrals	No. of Districts Responding	Response Identified	Don't Know	No Response
0	89	43.82 (39)	55.06 (49)	1.12 (1)
1	12	66.67 (8)	33.33 (4)	
2	9	88.89 (8)	11.11 (1)	
3	3	33.33 (1)	66.67 (2)	
4	5	80.00 (4)	20.00 (1)	
5	1	100.00 (1)		
6	1	100.00 (1)		
7	1		100.00 (1)	
9	6	100.00 (6)		
	127	53.54 (68)	45.67 (58)	.79 (1)

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses in parentheses

TABLE 7
TITLE OF RESPONDANT TO QUESTIONNAIRE

No. of Referrals	No. of Districts Reporting	Respondant: Teacher	Director of Spec. Ed.	Principal	Superintendent	Other
0	89	4.49 (4)	14.61 (13)	7.87 (7)	42.70 (38)	30.34 (27)
1	12	8.33 (1)	41.67 (5)	16.67 (2)	16.67 (2)	16.67 (2)
2	9	11.11 (1)	44.44 (4)	11.11 (1)	11.11 (1)	22.22 (2)
3	3		33.33 (1)			66.67 (2)
4	5		60.00 (3)		20.00 (1)	20.00 (1)
5	1					100.00 (1)
6	1		100.00 (1)			
7	1				100.00 (1)	
9	6		83.33 (5)			16.67 (1)
	127					

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses in parentheses

TABLE "A
AVERAGE OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTION ABOUT:
A) POTENTIAL EMPLOYER'S CONCEPTS
ABOUT MENTAL RETARDATES

No. of Referrals	No. Reporting	Not Responding	Mean
0	58	31	5.08
1	11	1	7.00
2	8	1	7.75
3	3	0	7.33
4	5	0	10.33
5	1	0	8.00
6	1	0	8.00
7	0	1	
9	5	1	8.60
	92	35	

TABLE "8B
AVERAGE OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTION ABOUT
POTENTIAL EMPLOYER'S ATTITUDE
TOWARDS HIRING MENTAL RETARDATES

No. of Referrals	No. Reporting	Not Responding	Mean
0	57	32	7.18
1	11	1	7.09
2	9	0	6.33
3	3	0	8.00
4	4	1	8.75
5	1	0	5.00
6	1	0	6.00
7	0	1	
9	5	1	6.80
	91	36	

TABLE 9
TEACHER'S PROFESSIONAL DEGREE

No. of Referrals	No. of Districts Reporting	Bachelor's	Master's	Master's + 10 hrs or more	No Response
N					
Response	21	9.72 (7)	11.69 (9)	11.63 (5)	
0	94	62.50 (45)	41.56 (32)	37.21 (16)	100.00
1	17	9.72 (7)	5.19 (4)	13.95 (6)	
2	9	2.78 (2)	3.90 (3)	9.30 (4)	
3	3		2.60 (2)	2.33 (1)	
4	20	8.33 (6)	12.99 (10)	9.30 (4)	
5	1		1.30 (1)		
6	3	1.39 (1)	2.60 (2)		
9	25	5.56 (4)	18.18 (14)	16.28 (7)	.52
	193	37.31 (72)	39.90 (77)	22.28 (43)	

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses in parentheses

TABLE 10
TEACHERS' STATE APPROVAL STATUS

No. of Referrals	No. of Teachers Reporting	Temporary	Full	No Response
No Response	21	4.76 (1)	90.48 (19)	4.76 (1)
0	94	34.04 (32)	60.64 (57)	5.32 (5)
1	17	29.41 (5)	64.71 (11)	5.88 (1)
2	9	22.22 (2)	77.77 (7)	
3	3		100.00 (3)	
4	20	25.00 (5)	70.00 (14)	5.00 (1)
5	1		100.00 (3)	
6	3		100.00 (3)	
9	25	16.00 (4)	76.00 (19)	8.00 (2)
	193	25.39 (49)	69.43 (134)	5.18 (10)

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses in parentheses

TABLE 11
TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE ABOUT
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

No. of Referrals	No. of Teachers Reporting	Familiam With DVR	Not Familiar With DVR	No Add. Inf. Needed	Add Inf. Needed	No Res
No Response	21	23.81 (5)	14.29 (3)		57.14 (12)	4.7 (1)
0	94	26.59 (25)	3.19 (3)	6.38 (16)	58.51 (55)	5.3 (5)
1	17	29.41 (5)			70.59 (12)	
2	9	55.55 (5)	11.11 (1)		33.33 (3)	
3	3	33.33 (1)			66.67 (2)	
4	20	55.00 (11)	5.00 (1)	5.00 (1)	35.00 (7)	
5	1				100.00 (1)	
6	3	100.00 (3)				
9	25	24.00 (6)	4.00 (1)		68.00 (17)	4.0 (1)
	193	31.61 (61)	4.66 (9)	3.63 (7)	56.48 (109)	3.63 (7)

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses in parentheses

TABLE 12A
AVERAGE OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTION ABOUT POTENTIAL EMPLOYER'S CONCEPTS ABOUT MENTAL RETARDATES

No. of Referrals	No. of Districts Reporting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	No Response
To Resp.	21	4.76 (1)	4.76 (1)	4.76 (1)		4.76 (1)	4.76 (1)	4.76 (1)	14.29 (3)	9.52 (2)	19.05 (4)	9.52 (2)	9.52 (2)	4.76 (1)	4.76 (1)
0	94	1.06 (1)	1.06 (1)	2.13 (2)	7.45 (7)	5.32 (5)	10.64 (10)	8.51 (8)	11.70 (11)	12.77 (12)	14.89 (14)	8.51 (8)	6.38 (6)	2.13 (2)	1.06 (1) 6.4 (6)
1	17	5.88 (1)	5.88 (1)			5.88 (1)	11.76 (2)	11.76 (2)	11.76 (2)	11.76 (2)	5.89 (1)	17.65 (3)			11.7 (2)
2	9	11.11 (1)	11.11 (1)						22.22 (2)	11.11 (1)	11.11 (1)		22.22 (2)		11.11 (1)
3	3				33.3 (1)				33.3 (1)					33.3 (1)	
4	20					5. (1)	20. (4)	5. (1)	15. (3)	5. (1)	15. (3)	10. (2)		10. (2)	5. 10. (1) (2)
5	1								100. (1)						
6	3							33.3 (1)	33.3 (1)	33.3 (1)					
9	25				4. (1)	8. (2)	4. (1)	24. (6)	12. (3)	28. (7)	12. (3)		4. (1)		4 (1)

Figures given in percentages
Number of Actual Responses in parentheses

TABLE 12B
POTENTIAL EMPLOYER ATTITUDE TOWARDS HIRING MENTAL RETARDATES

No. of Responses	No. of Districts Reporting	RAW SCORES 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	No Response	Mean
No Resp.	21			4.76	4.7	14.3		14.3		47.6	4.7	4.7				4.7	7.7
0	94			5.32 (5)	4.3 (4)	8.5 (8)	10.6 (10)	22.3 (21)	3.2 (3)	22.3 (21)	5.3 (5)	2.1 (2)		3.2 (3)		7.5 (7)	7.3
1	17				5.8 (1)	17.1 (3)	17.6 (3)			23.5 (4)	11.7 (2)	11.7 (2)				11.7 (2)	7.6
2	9			11.1 (1)	11.1 (1)	11.1 (1)	22.2 (2)	11.1 (1)	11.1 (1)	22.2 (2)							6.3
3	3							33.3 (1)			66.6 (2)						9.00
4	20			5. (1)		10. (2)	20. (4)		5. (1)	30. (6)	5. (1)	10. (2)		5. (1)		10. (2)	8.3
5	1			100. (1)													5.00
6	3			66.67 (2)						33.3 (1)							5.67
9	25			4. (1)	8. (2)	4. (1)	12. (3)	28. (7)		16. (4)	4. (1)	12. (3)		4. (1)		8. (2)	7.61
	193																

, Figures given in percentages
Number of actual responses in parentheses

TABLE 13
STATE APPROVAL

Degree	No. of Teacher Responses	Temporary	Full	No Responses
No Answer	1			100.00 (1)
Bachelor's	72	38.89 (28)	54.17 (39)	6.94 (5)
Master's	77	16.88 (13)	79.22 (61)	3.90 (3)
Master's plus ten hours or more	43	18.60 (8)	79.07 (34)	2.33 (1)

TABLE 14
COURSE WORK IN
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION & GUIDANCE

Degree	No. of Teacher Responses	Vocational Rehab.	Guidance	Both	No Responses
No Answer	1				100.00 (1)
Bachelor's	72	4.17 (3)	43.06 (31)	9.72 (7)	43.06 (31)
Master's	77	1.30 (1)	57.14 (44)	24.68 (19)	16.88 (13)
Master's plus ten hours or more	43	2.33 (1)	44.19 (19)	41.86 (18)	11.63 (5)

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses in parentheses

TABLE 15
KNOWLEDGE ABOUT
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Degree	No. of Teacher Responses	Familiar With DVR	Not Familiar with DVR	Add. Inf. Needed	No Add. Inf. Needed	No Respons
No answer	1			100.00 (1)		
Bachelor's	72	22.22 (16)	6.94 (5)	65.28 (47)	2.78 (2)	2.78 (2)
Master's	77	37.66 (29)	1.30 (1)	50.65 (39)	5.19 (4)	5.19 (4)
Master's plus ten hours or more	43	37.21 (16)	6.98 (3)	51.16 (22)	2.33 (1)	2.33 (1)

TABLE 16
WHERE FAMILIARITY WITH
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACQUIRED

Degree	No. of Teacher Responses	Academic Training	On-the-job Experience	Other	No Response
No answer	1				100.00 (1)
Bachelor's	72	44.44 (32)	12.50 (9)	19.44 (14)	23.61 (17)
Master's	77	45.45 (35)	18.18 (14)	15.58 (12)	20.78 (16)
Master's plus ten hours or more	43	53.49 (23)	25.58 (11)	13.95 (6)	6.98 (3)

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses in parentheses

TABLE 17
SHOULD VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION
SERVE MENTAL RETARDATES

Degree	No. of Teacher Responses	Yes	No	Undecided	No Respons
No Response	1	100.00 (1)			
Bachelor's	72	84.72 (61)	4.17 (3)	8.33 (6)	2.78 (2)
Master's	77	89.61 (69)	1.30 (1)	9.09 (7)	
Master's plus ten hours or more	43	90.70 (39)		4.65 (2)	4.65 (2)

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses in parentheses

TABLE 18 A
TEACHER"S PERCEPTIONS ABOUT POTENTIAL EMPLOYER'S CONCEPTS ABOUT MENTAL RETARDATES

Degree of Teacher Responding	No. of teachers responding	RAW SCORE 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	No. Resp.	Mean
No Response	1									100.00 (1)						9.00
Bachelor	72			4.17 (3)	5.55 (4)	6.94 (5)	12.50 (9)	25,00 (18)	2.78 (2)	27.78 (20)	8.33 (6)	1.39 (1)			5.55 (4)	7.31
Master's	77			3.90 (3)	7.79 (6)	11.69 (9)	5.19 (4)	22.08 (17)		25.97 (20)	3.90 (3)	5.19 (4)		3.90 (3)	10.39 (8)	7.45
Master's plus ten hours or more	43			4.65 (2)	4.65 (2)	6.98 (3)	16.28 (7)	16.28 (7)	6.98 (3)	16.28 (7)	6.98 (3)	11.63 (5)		4.65 (2)	4.65 (2)	7.76

TABLE 18 B
POTENTIAL EMPLOYER'S ATTITUDES TOWARD HIRING MENTAL RETARDATES

Degree of Teacher Responding	No. of Teachers Responding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	No Response	Mean
No Resp.	1								100 (1)								8.00
Bachelor	72	2.78 (2)	1.39 (1)	5.55 (4)	4.17 (3)	6.94 (5)	13.89 (10)	13.89 (1	15.28 (11)	11.11 (8)	6.94 (5)	8.33 (6)	1.39 (1)	1.39 (1)	6.94 (5)		8.19
Masters	77	2.60 1.30 (2)	(1)	2.60 (2)	6.49 (5)	2.60 (2)	9.09 (7)	9.09 (7)	10.39 (8)	16.88 (13))	15.58 (12)	7.79 (6)	3.90 (3)	3.90 (3)	1.30 (1)	6.49 (5)	8.15
M Masters plus 10 or more hours	43		6.98 (3)			11.63 (5)	13.95 (6)	4.65 (2)	18.60 (8)	4.65 (2)	18.60 (8)	9.30 (4)	4.65 (2)	4.65 (2)	2.33 (1)	4.65 (2)	8.07

Figures given in percentages
No of responses in parentheses

TABLE 19

COURSE WORK IN VOCATIONAL REHABILLTATION AND GUIDANCE

State Approval	No. of Teachers Reporting	COURSE WORK			No Respons
		Voc. Rehab.	Guidance	Both	
No answer	10	10.00 (1)	30.00 (3)	10.00 (1)	50.00 (5)
Temporary	49	4.08 (2)	53.06 (26)	10.20 (5)	32.65 (16)
Full	134	1.49 (2)	48.51 (65)	28.36 (38)	21.64 (29)

TABLE 20

KNOWLEDGE ABOUR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

State Approval	No. of Teacher Responses	Familiar With DVR	Not Familiar with DVR	No Add. Inf. Needed	Add. Inf. Needed	No Response
No answer	10	40.00 (4)	10.00 (1)		50.00 (5)	
Temporary	49	16.33 (8)	6.12 (3)	4.08 (2)	65.31 (32)	8.16 (4)
Full	134	36.57 (49)	3.73 (5)	3.73 (5)	53.73 (72)	2.24 (3)

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses given in parentheses

TABLE 21
WHERE FAMILIARITY WITH
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACQUIRED

State Approval	No. of Teacher Responses	Academic Training	On-the-job Experience	Other	No. Response
No answer	10	50.00 (5)		40.00 (4)	10.00 (1)
Temporary	49	30.61 (15)	12.25 (6)	18.37 (9)	38.78 (19)
Full	134	52.24 (70)	20.90 (28)	14.18 (19)	12.69 (17)

TABLE 22
SHOULD VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION
SERVE MENTAL
RETARDATES

State Approval	No. of Teacher Responses	RESPONSE Yes	No	Undecided	No Response
No answer	10	90.00		10.00	
Temporary	49	83.67 (41)	2.04 (1)	10.20 (5)	4.18 (2)
Full	134	89.55 (120)	2.24 (3)	6.72 (9)	1.49 (2)

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses given in parentheses

TABLE 23A
TEACHER PERCEPTIONS ABOUT POTENTIAL EMPLOYER's CONCEPTS ABOUT MENTAL RETARDATION

State Approval	No. Responding	RAW SCORES 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	No Response
No Answer	10					10. (1)			40. (4)	20. (1)	10. (1)	10. (1)			10. (1)	
Temporary	49		2.04 (1)		8.16 (4)	8.16 (4)	12.2 (6)	8.16 (4)	10.2 (5)	14.3 (7)	14.3 (7)	8.2 (4)	6.1 (3)	2.0 (1)		6.1 (3)
Full	134	2.99 (4)	2.24 (3)	2.24 (3)	3.73 (5)	3.73 (5)	8.96 (12)	11.2 (15)	13.4 (18)	12.7 (17)	13.4 (18)	7.5 (10)	5.9 (8)	3.7 (5)	1.49 (2)	6.7 (9)

TABLE 23B
POTENTIAL EMPLOYER'S ATTITUDES TOWARDS HIRING MENTAL RETARDATES

State Approval	No. Responding	RAW SCORES 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	No Response	Mean
No Response	10				10. (1)	10. (1)		40. (4)		30. (3)						10. (1)	
Temporary	49			2.0 (1)	6.1 (3)	6.1 (3)	18.3 (8)	16.3 (8)	4. (2)	26.5 (13)	4.	6.1 (3)		2.0 (1)		8.1 (4)	
Full	134			5.2 (7)	5.9 (8)	9.7 (13)	8.2 (11)	22.3 (30)	2.2 (3)	23.8 (32)	7.4 (10)	5.2 (7)		2.9 (4)		6.7 (9)	7

Figures given in percentages
Number of actual repponses in parentheses

TABLE 24 A
PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF TEACHERS
ACADEMIC DEGREE AND REFERRALS
FROM SCHOOL DISTRICT

Degree	No. of Referrals from Employing Dist.	Referrals from Employing Dist.	Totals
Masters	45	20	65
Masters plus 10 hours or more	36	32	68
N	97	74	171

TABLE 24B
STATE APPROVALS AND REFERRALS
FROM SCHOOL DISTRICT

State Approval	No. of Referrals from Employing Dist.	Referrals from Employing Dist.	Totals
Temporary	32	16	48
Full	57	58	115
N	89	74	163

TABLE 25
SHOULD VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVE MENTAL RETARDATES

Actual No. of Years Experience	No. of Counselors Responding	Yes	No	Undecided
0	1	100.00 (1)		
1	14	71.43 (10)	14.29 (2)	14.29 (2)
2.	26	80.77 (21)		19.23 (5)
3	1	100.00 (1)		
4				
5				
6	2	50.00 (1)		50.00 (1)
7	5	100.00 (5)		
8	2	100.00 (2)		
9	10	90.00 (9)	10.00 (1)	

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses given in parentheses

TABLE 26

COMMENTS ABOUT THE ROLE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AND MENTAL RETARDATION

Actual No. of Years Experience	No. of Counselors Responding	Positive	Negative	Neutral	No Respons
0	1				100.00 (1)
1	14	50.00 (7)	28.57 (4)	14.29 (2)	7.14 (1)
2.	26	61.54 (16)	26.92 (7)	3.85 (1)	7.70 (2)
3	1				100.00 (1)
4					
5					
6	2	100.00 (2)			
7	5	20.00 (1)	60.00 (3)	20.00 (1)	
8	2	50.00 (1)		50.00 (1)	
9	10	40.00 (4)	20.00 (2)	10.00 (1)	30.00 (3)

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses given in parentheses

TABLE 27
KNOWLEDGE OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR MENTAL RETARDATION

Actual Years of Experience	No. of Counselors Responding	Yes	No	No Response
0	1		100.00 (1)	
1	14	50.00 (7)	42.86 (6)	7.14 (1)
2	26	73.08 (19)	26.93 (7)	
3	1		100.00 (1)	
4				
5				
6	2	50.00 (1)	50.00 (1)	
7	5	100.00 (5)		
8	2	100.00 (2)		
9	10	60.00 (6)	30.00 (3)	10.00 (1)

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses given in parentheses

TABLE 28A
COUNSELORS' PERCEPTION ABOUT POTENTIAL EMPLOYER'S CONCEPTS ABOUT MENTAL RETARDATES

No. of Years of Experience	No Response	1-2	3	4	5	6								Total	Mean
0	100.00 (1)													1	
1	14.29 (2)				7.14 (1)	7.14 (1)	21.43 (3)	14.29 (2)	7.14 (1)	14.29 (2)	14.29 (2)			14	8.25
2	3.85 (1)		3.85 (1)	3.85 (1)	3.85 (1)	7.69 (2)	11.54 (3)	19.23 (5)	15.38 (4)	11.54 (3)	3.85 (1)	7.69 (2)	7.69 (2)	26	9.36
3				100 (1)										1	4.00
4															
5															
6			50.00 (1)			50.00 (1)								2	8.00
7			40.00 (2)		20.00 (1)	20.00 (1)				(1)				5	8.40
8						50.00 (1)	50.00 (1)							2	8.50
9		10.00 (1)	20.00 (2)			20.00 (2)	10.00 (1)	10.00 (1)		20.00 (2)	10.00 (1)			10	8.60

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses given in parentheses

TABLE 28B
POTENTIAL EMPLOYER's ATTITUDES TOWARDS HIRING MENTAL RETARDATES

Actual No. of Years of Experience	No response	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Total	Mean
0	1														1	
1	14.29 (2)						21.43 (3)	21.43 (3)		35.71 (5)		7.14 (1)			14	7.9
2	3.85 (1)			3.85 (1)	11.54 (3)		7.69 (2)	15.38 (4)	3.85 (1)	38.46 (10)	3.85 (1)	11.54 (3)			26	7.9
3										100 (1)					1	9.00
4																
5																
6				50.00 (1)				50.00 (1)							2	5.00
7					20.00 (1)			20.00 (1)		40.00 (2)		20.00 (1)			5	8.20
8								50.00 (1)		50.00 (1)					2	8.00
9	10.00 (1)				10.00 (1)	10.00 (1)	10.00 (1)	10.00 (1)	10.00 (1)	20.00 (2)	20.00 (2)	20.00 (2)			10	7.56

Figures given in percentages
Number of responses given in parentheses

School Cover Letter

**PERSONAL LETTER -
NOT MIMEOGRAPHED**

Dear :

Your school district has been identified by the Michigan Department of Public Instruction as having a Secondary Type "A" or Type "C" program for the mentally retarded.

In co-operation with the Department of Public Instruction, Michigan State University is investigating the liaison and/or communication between the Michigan Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and school systems having secondary programs for the mentally retarded. We are also examining the nature of professional training within both of these areas as well as the attitudes and opinions of personnel.

One sheet of this questionnaire (attached) concerns program information and should be answered by an appropriate person. The other page(s) is (are) intended for teacher response. Since there are relatively few secondary programs for the mentally retarded in the state, it is important that we receive your co-operation.

The results of this study may have an impact upon the direction and future of secondary programs for the mentally retarded, the preparation of teachers in this area, and the training of rehabilitation counselors. Please take a few moments to answer this questionnaire and return it in the envelope provided.

This study is confidential. School districts and personnel will not be identified in any reports.

Sincerely,

**Henry Gottwald, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
Special Education
Project Director**

HG:em

PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE

School District_____Code Number_____

1. What is the approximate total school enrollment in your district?____

2. How many teachers and/or consultants for the mentally retarded do you have in your district?
   Jr. High_____ Sr. High_____

3. How many mentally retarded students are served in your program?
   Type "A"_____ Type "C"_____
   Male_____ Male_____
   Female_____ Female_____

4. How long has your district had a secondary program for the mentally retarded?_____

5. How many students have gone through (finished) this secondary program
   (1) in the last year_____; male_____female_____
   (2) in the last 5 years_____; male_____female_____
   (Mark NA if not applicable)

6. How many of these students have been referred to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation
   (1) in the last year_____; male_____female_____
   (2) in the last 5 years_____; male_____female_____

7. How many of these students have been accepted as clients by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation
   (1) in the last year_____; male_____female _____
   (2) in the last 5 years_____; male_____female_____

8. Does your school district have a "cut off" point in terms of minimum and maximum I.Q. for admission to programs for the mentally retarded?
   yes_____no_____if yes, approximately what are they?_____

9. Name of local OVR counselor (a)_____
   (b) Don't know_____

10. Title or position of person answering this questionnaire.

    _____

Teacher Cover Letter

Dear Teacher:

Your school district has been identified by the Michigan Department of Public Instruction as having a Secondary Type "A" or Type "C" program for the mentally retarded.

In co-operation with the Department of Public Instruction, Michigan State University is investigating the liaison and/or communication between the Michigan Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and school systems having secondary programs for the mentally retarded. We are also examining the nature of professional training within both of these areas as well as the attitudes and opinions of personnel.

Since there are relatively few secondary programs for the mentally retarded in the state, it is important that we receive your co-operation.

The results of this study may have an impact upon the direction and future of secondary programs for the mentally retarded, the preparation of teachers in this area, and the training of rehabilitation counselors. Please take a few moments to answer this questionnaire and return it in the envelope provided.

This study is confidential. School districts and personnel will not be identified in any reports.

Sincerely,

Henry Gottwald, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
Special Education
Project Director

HG:em

Teacher Questionnaire

School District_____Code Number_____

A. 1. Data: (a) sex: male_____female_____age_____

(b) degree: college or university_____

bachelors_____masters_____
date date

plus_____

(c) teaching certificate: elementary_____
date

secondary_____undergraduate major_____
date

graduate major_____

(d) teaching experience: _____years.

_____years with regular class_____grade_____subjec

____years with retarded(____elementary____secondary)

( ) Temporary State approval MR._____
Full State approval to teach MR:_____

2. In your professional preparation, were you <u>required</u> to take any courses in:

(a) vocational rehabilitation yes_____no_____

(b) guidance and counseling yes_____no_____

(c) <u>did</u> you take one? If so, in what? _____

3. Are you familiar with vocational rehabilitation services?

(a) yes_____ if yes, where did you acquire familiarit

(b) no_____ _____

4. Do you feel your knowledge concerning vocational rehabilitation services is adequate?

   (a) yes_____ If no, do you feel any need for this type of information?

   (b) no_____ _____

5. Do you believe that vocational rehabilitation should serve the mentally retarded?

   (a) yes_____ Reason:

   (b) no_____

   (c) undecided_____

B. 1. The following statements represent the ways in which different employers might feel about hiring mentally retarded persons. In rank of priority (mark 1 as highest priority; and 2 as next highest) indicate the two statements that you perceive to best indicate <u>their (the employer's) opinions about hiring the mentall retarded</u>.

CHECK TWO

____ 1. I would not hire a mentally retarded person under any circumstances.

____ 2. I would hire a mentally retarded person in an emergency.

____ 3. I would hire a mentally retarded person only on a temporary basis.

____ 4. I would hire a mentally retarded person only on a trial basis.

____ 5. I would hire a mentally retarded person only if he would work at a lower salary than normal persons.

____ 6. I would hire a mentally retarded person even if I felt that he could not do the job as well as a normal person.

____ 7. I would hire a mentally retarded person as readily as I would a normal person.

B. 2. To the best of your ability, indicate (check) what you believe <u>that the average potential employer</u> (not you) <u>perceives as being characteristic of the employable mentally retarded young adult</u>.

____have odd physical appearance	____can't pay attention for a long time
____mentally slow	____emotionally uncontrolable
____immoral	____poor in school work
____have peculiar habits	____law breakers
____learn slowly	____limited understanding of what they read
____have difficulty remembering	____mentally ill
____not interested in school work	____in need of affection.

COUNSELOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Vocational Rehabilitation Office_____ Code_____

A. 1. Data: (a) Sex: Male_____ female_____ age_____

(b) degree: college or university_____

bachelor's_____ master's_____
date date

plus_____

(c) do you have a teaching certificate? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, what kind?_____

(d) what was your undergraduate major?_____

what was your graduate major? _____

(e) number of years experience as a vocational rehabilitation counselor_____

(f) what prior experiences have you had that are germaine to your present position?

2. In your professional preparation, were you <u>required</u> to take any courses in:

(a) mental retardation Yes_____ No_____

(b) general Special Education Yes_____ No_____

(c) <u>did</u> you take any in:

Mental retardation Yes_____ No_____

General Special Education Yes_____ No_____

If yes to either of these, what?

3. Are you familiar with the process of education for the:

(a) emotionally disturbed Yes_____ No_____

(b) mentally retarded Yes_____ No_____

(c) other Special Education areas (blind, deaf, orthopedic etc.) Yes_____ No_____

If yes, where did you acquire this familiarity?

4. Do you feel that your knowledge concerning the educational process of the following areas is adequate for your role?

   (a) mental retardation Yes_____ No_____

   (b) emotionally disturbed Yes_____ No_____

   (c) other Special Education areas Yes_____ No_____

5. Do you believe that Vocational Rehabilitation should service the mentally retarded?

   (a) Yes_____

   (b) No _____

   (c) undecided_____

6. In brief essay, comment upon vocational rehabilitation and the area of mental retardation giving opinions, experience, etc. Brief phrases and/or statements will suffice!

B. 1. The following statements represent the ways in which different employers might feel about hiring mentally retarded persons. In rank of priority (mark 1 as highest priority; and 2 as next highest) indicate the two statements that you perceive to best indicate <u>their (the employer's) opinions about hiring the mentally retarded</u>.

CHECK TWO

_____1. I would not hire a mentally retarded person under any circumstances.

_____2. I would hire a mentally retarded person only in an emergency.

_____3. I would hire a mentally retarded person only on a temporary basis.

_____4. I would hire a mentally retarded person only on a trial basis.

_____5. I would hire a mentally retarded person only if he would work at a lower salary than normal persons.

_____6. I would hire a mentally retarded person even if I felt that he could not do the job as well as a normal person.

_____7. I would hire a mentally retarded person as readily as I would a normal person.

B. 2. To the best of your ability, indicate (check) what you believe <u>that the average potential employer</u> (not you) <u>perceives as being characteristic of the employable mentally retarded young adult</u>.

_____ have odd physical appearance

_____ mentally slow

_____ immoral

_____ have peculiar habits

_____ learn slowly

_____ have difficulty remembering

_____ not interested in school work

_____ can't pay attention for a long time

_____ emotionally uncontrolable

_____ poor in school work

_____ law breakers

_____ limited understanding of what they read

_____ mentally ill

_____ in need of affection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barker, B. W.. "Preparation of Retarded Clients and Employers for On-the-Job Training and Placement," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LVII, No. 4 (April, 1953), 580-586.

Cohen, Julius S. "Community Day Work in an Institutional Vocational Training Program," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXVI, No. 4 (January, 1962), 574-579.

Cohen, Julius S. "Employer Attitudes Toward Hiring Mentally Retarded Individuals," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXVII, No. 5 (March, 1963), 705-713.

Detroit Special Education - Vocational Rehabilitation Project.

DiMichael, Salvatore G (ed.). Vocational Rehabilitation of the Mentally Retarded. Rehabilitation Service Series No. 123. Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1950.

DiMichael, Salvatore G. "History and Development of Rehabilitation of the Mentally Retarded," Journal of Rehabilitation, XXVIII, No. 6 (November-December, 1962), 24-26.

DiMichael, Salvatore G. "Vocational Rehabilitation and the Mentally Retarded: A Statement of Issues," Preparation for Gainful Employment. Bulletin 1959, No. 28, Rehabilitation Service Series No. 507. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959, 10-19.

Dybwad, Gunnar. "Implementing Panel Recommendations: Problems and Procedures," Journal of Rehabilitation, XXVIII, No. 6 (November-December, 1962), 44-46.

Dybwad, Gunnar. "Mental Retardation: A Billion-Dollar Challenge," Editorial, The Journal of Rehabilitation, XXVII, No. 3 (May-June, 1962).

Engel, Anna. "Employment of the Mentally Retarded," Vocational Rehabilitation of the Mentally Retarded, Ed. Salvatore G. DiMichael, Rehabilitation Service Series No. 123. Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1950, 80-107.

Eskridge, Charles S. and Partridge, Don L. "Vocational Rehabilitation for Exceptional Children Through Special Education," Exceptional Children, XXIX, No. 9 (May, 1963), 452-458.

Fraenkel, William A. "Present Status of Rehabilitation for the Mentally Retarded," Journal of Rehabilitation, XXVIII, No. 6 (November-December, 1962), 27-30.

Goldstein, Herbert, and Heber, Rick F. "Summary of the Conference," Preparation of Mentally Retarded Youth for Gainful Employment, Bulletin 1959, No. 28, Rehabilitation Service Series No. 507, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959, 20-39.

Guide to Job Placement of the Mentally Retarded. The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Melvin J. Maas, Chairman. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964, iii.

Himelstein, Phillip. "Vocational Guidance for the Mentally Handicapped," Education, LXXXIII, 275-278.

Hitchcock, Arthur A. "Vocational Training and Job Adjustment of the Mentally Deficient," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LIX, No. 1 (July, 1954), 100-106.

Kolstoe, Oliver P. and Shafter, Albert J. "Employability Prediction for Mentally Retarded Adults: A Methodological Note," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXVI, No. 2 (September, 1961), 287-289.

Kruger, Daniel H. "Trends in Service Employment: Implications for the Educable Mentally Retarded," Exceptional Children, XXX, No. 4 (December, 1963) 167-172.

La Grange Area, Illinois. Pre-Vocational Program for the Educable Mentally Handicapped.

Lee, John J. "Implications of Federal Matching Funds for the Michigan Division of Vocational Rehabilitation," Paper read before the Michigan Welfare League Forum, East Lansing, Michigan, March 13, 1963.

Mayo, Leonard W. "Report of The President's Panel on Mental Retardation," Journal of Rehabilitation, XXVIII, No. 6 (November - December, 1962), 40-43.

Mayo, Leonard W. "Philosophy and Recommendation of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation Relating to Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Training," Exceptional Children, XXIX, No. 9 (May, 1963), 425-430.

Michigan Department of Public Instruction. Disabled Workers Are Indispensable. Lansing, Michigan: Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1951.

Moore, Alfred H. "The Importance of Social Development and Adjustment in Rehabilitating the Retarded," Presented at a conference on Work Evaluation and Employment Preparation, University of Kansas, February 5-8, 1961. Washington: Goodwill Industries of America, Inc., 1961.

National Action to Combat Mental Retardation. The President's Panel on Mental Retardation. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, October, 1962.

National Association for Retarded Children, Inc. The Mentally Retarded and Their Vocational Rehabilitation: A Resource Handbook. New York: National Association for Retarded Children, Inc., 1961.

National Rehabilitation Association. "Rehabilitation of the Mentally Retarded," Journal of Rehabilitation, XXVIII, No. 6 (November-December, 1962) 21-48.

Palstola, O. P. "Examination of Some Characteristics which Discriminate Between Employed and Not Employed Mentally Retarded Males," American Journal of Mental Deficiency (November, 1961), 66, 472-82.

Peck, John. Clearing in the Wilderness, Austin: University of Texas Printing Division, 1963.

Peckham, Ralf A. "Problems in Job Adjustment of the Mentally Retarded," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LVI, No. 2 (October, 1951). (Presented at the Seventy-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Association on Mental Deficiency at New York City, May, 1951.)

Potts, Jane H. "Vocational Rehabilitation for the Mentally Retarded in Michigan," Vocational Rehabilitation of the Mentally Retarded, ed. Salvatore G. DiMichael. Rehabilitation Service Series No. 123. Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1950, 140-165.

Power, F. Ray. "Major Issues: A Plan of Action," Journal of Rehabilitation, XXVIII, No. 6 (November-December, 1962), 31-33.

Preparation of Mentally Retarded Youth for Gainful Employment. A Study Sponsored Jointly by the U. S. Office of Education, the U. S. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Project on Technical Planning of the American Association on Mental Deficiency. Bulletin 1959, No. 28, Rehabilitation Service Series No. 507. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959.

Seidenfeld, Morton A. "Gaps and Trends in Rehabilitation of the Retarded," Journal of Rehabilitation, XXVIII, No. 6 (November-December, 1962), 37-39. (A)

Seidenfeld, Morton A. "Mental Retardation Activities of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare," Rehabilitation Service Series No. 60-62. (Communication to Divisions of Vocational Rehabilitation: Commissions and Other Agencies for the Blind, June 14, 1962.) (B)

Seidenfeld, Morton A. Mental Retardation: A Further Assessment of the Problem. Rehabilitation Service Series No. 63-62. Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1962. (C)

Strickland, Conwell G. "Job Training Placement for Retarded Youth," Exceptional Children, XXXI, No. 2 (October, 1964), 83-86.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Special Problems in Vocational Rehabilitation of the Mentally Retarded, Madison, Wisconsin, 1963.

Voelker, Paul H. "The Public School System," Vocational Training and Rehabilitation of Exceptional Children. Proceedings of the 1957 Spring Conference of the Woods School, held in Chicago, May 10-11. 92-99.

1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth. Recommendations: Composite Report of Forum Findings. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960.